

### REMARKS

Claims 20 to 27, 54 to 61, and 80 to 88 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 20 to 27, 54 to 61, and 81 to 85 are allowable.

Turning to the rejection, claims 86 to 88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,173,881 (Sindle). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 86 is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium. The computer program comprises instructions that cause a processor to cause a waveform having a predetermined shape to be transmitted, receive a signal, analyze a shape of the signal, and determine if the signal comprises an echo of the waveform based on analysis of the shape of the signal and the waveform having the predetermined shape.

The applied Sindle patent is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 86, particularly with respect to analyzing a shape of a signal, and determining if the signal comprises an echo of the waveform based, in part, on analysis of the shape of the signal.

In this regard, Sindle describes a vehicle detection system that outputs a signal and that detects a reflection of that signal in order to determine proximity to another object. Sindle key codes the signal in order to differentiate the reflection of the signal from extraneous environmental noise and from signals from other vehicles sending out coded

signals. As described, e.g., in column 6, lines 59 to 64, and as shown in Figs 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, and 3c of Sindle, key coding involves frequency keying or pulse-code-modulating the signals. Sindle compares the frequencies of transmitted signals to those of received signals in order to determine if a reflection corresponds to an output signal. However, as is known to those of skill in the art, signal frequency and shape are not the same thing. Applicant therefore submits that key coding a signal and comparing frequencies of transmitted and received signals is not the same as analyzing a shape of a signal and determining if the signal comprises an echo of a waveform based on analysis of the shape of the signal. For at least this reason, claim 86 is believed to be patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's attorney can be reached at the address shown below. Telephone calls regarding this application should be directed to 617-521-7896.

Please apply any fees associated with this Amendment, which have not already been covered by check, to Deposit Account 06-1050.


Applicant : Mark Chiappetta  
Serial No. : 09/921,181  
Filed : August 2, 2001  
Page : 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 09945-006001  
Client's Ref.: CTR-3 (Sonar Scanner)

Date: February 12, 2004

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906  
20804566.doc

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul A. Pysher  
Reg. No. 40,780